

# College

# Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON  
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

CHAS. W. ROBERTS, *University of Illinois*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

FREDERICK BRACHER, *Pomona College*; CATHERINE FOSTER, *Bennington College*; WRIGHT THOMAS, *State U. of New York, State Teachers College at Cortland*; CARLTON WELLS, *University of Michigan*; RICHARD WELLS, *Carnegie Tech*;  
J. HOOPER WISE, *University of Florida*

Vol. III

February, 1952

No. 1

MOTIVATION OF FRESHMAN COMPOSITION ON THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL— <i>Edith E. Layer</i> .....	3
MOTIVATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COMPOSITION AND/OR COMMUNICATION COURSES— <i>James Hocker Mason</i> .....	7
DARKNESS VISIBLE: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR LLOYD— <i>Martin Steinmann, Jr.</i> .....	11
PROFESSORS' ENGLISH— <i>Robert J. Geist</i> .....	16
SECRETARY'S REPORT NO. 4— <i>Glenn J. Christensen</i> .....	21
PREVIEW OF THE CLEVELAND MEETING .....	23

*College Composition and Communication* is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to W. Wilbur Hatfield, 211 West 68th Street, Chicago 21, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to Charles W. Roberts, 204a Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

# National Council of Teachers of English

## Conference on College Composition and Communication

### 1952 OFFICERS

HAROLD B. ALLEN, *Chairman*  
University of Minnesota

KARL DYKEMA, *Associate Chairman*  
Youngstown College

T. A. BARNHART, *Assistant Chairman*  
State Teachers, St. Cloud

GLENN J. CHRISTENSEN, *Secretary*  
Lehigh University

W. WILBUR HATFIELD, *Treasurer*  
211 West 68th St., Chicago

CHARLES W. ROBERTS, *Editor*  
University of Illinois

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### UNIVERSITIES

HAROLD E. BRIGGS, Southern California

C. REXFORD DAVIS, Rutgers

GLENN H. LEGGETT, Ohio State

HENRY W. SAMS, Chicago

JOHN HODGES, Tennessee

FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Wisconsin

JEROME ARCHER, Marquette

MCDONALD WILLIAMS, Wilberforce

#### LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

WAYNE L. BRITTON, San Francisco State

JAMES H. MASON, Arkansas State

WATERS TURPIN, Morgan State

STRANG LAWSON, Colgate

F. EARL WARD, Macalester

L. A. KING, Muskingum

#### TEACHERS COLLEGES

PAUL W. BARRUS, East Texas State

WILLIAM T. BEAUCHAMP, Geneseo

JANE DALE, Oregon College of Ed.

KATHRYN SCOTT, Georgia State College  
for Women

#### TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

HOWARD R. BARTLETT, Mass. Inst. Tech.

MENTOR WILLIAMS, Ill. Inst. Tech.

T. J. FARR, Tenn. Polytech. Inst.

EMMA BEEKMAN, Los Angeles Trade and  
Tech.

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Purdue

#### JUNIOR COLLEGES

JOSIAH L. GEIST, Wright

SHANNON MORTON, Wilmington

DONALD BIRD, Stephens

GORDON MILLS, Los Angeles

# Motivation of Freshman Composition on the University Level<sup>1</sup>

EDITH E. LAYER<sup>2</sup>

I was scheduled for a section of English 102 during the first summer session. At the first meeting the class came in slowly and sat in the last three rows. There wasn't even any pleasant exchange of greetings among them. Apparently they were resigned to finishing their required Freshman English during the summer while their friends were vacationing or holding down remunerative jobs. My suspicions that many of them had had English 101 elsewhere were confirmed in a short questionnaire. Eleven different colleges and universities were represented by the twenty-three students who were facing me. In answer to the last question, "In what way can a second semester of freshman English serve your needs (a) in college? (b) after college?" most of the students wrote the answers they thought were expected. Sam Atkins, however, came to the point with his terse statement. "I need the English credit." He misspelled the word "credit" and he forgot to capitalize "English," but he was to be commended, I thought, for his honest and forthright answer, and he *did* end the sentence with a period!

In trying to motivate freshman writing, the instructor has to face this apathy, this grim acceptance of requirements or, at any rate, a lack of interest or curiosity about the course on the part of a large number of those who appear in his classes. How can we sell freshman English? For sell it we must if we are to get any degree of active

cooperation from those who will write the themes we assign and read the selections we expect them to discuss. Since all writing is communication, or at least the attempt to communicate, there must be the desire or the need to communicate if ideas are to be exchanged.

It appears to me that there is a fallacy in the assumption that there is a difference in the problem of motivation in different types of colleges. Although the circumstances which cause the student to place himself in one type of college or another may differ, the human material with which our problem of motivation is concerned is no different. A student's age, his purpose in going to college and his cultural background may have been factors in his choice, but once he appears in freshman English, we have the same problem in any type of college of arousing his interest and tapping his resources.

As the freshman begins his adjustment to college, he soon becomes aware of his language needs. He wants to make a good impression on his freshman instructor, and his first themes are filled with big words and formal language. He struggles with text book assignments that are written in long involved sentences; he tries to take notes on lectures sometimes not too well organized or presented; he takes essay type examinations which call for quick evaluations and conclusions and a command of language that comes only after considerable practice.

I should like to suggest that the first bid for the kind of cooperation we need in motivation that succeeds in getting results is to approach freshman English

<sup>1</sup>A paper read at the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the NCTE, Hotel Sheraton-Gibson, Cincinnati, November 23, 1951.

<sup>2</sup>Western Reserve University.

as a service course. How can a course in communications help the student while he is on the campus and serve his vocational needs after he leaves college? While in college, he will need to read and digest the material in content courses and write essay type examinations and term papers. He will need to understand and apply the principles of good logical organization. In his extra curricular activities, he will need to know how to use English in effective publicity, good parliamentary procedure, and speaking before groups. People in business and the professions are continually asking, "Why can't college graduates dictate good letters, word contracts accurately, compile satisfactory reports and write readable articles for the trade journals?" A course in Business English is the answer for those who know definitely that they are going into business, but what about the many majors in other fields such as political science, psychology, economics, or the sciences, and even teaching in fields other than English, who become aware only after it is too late that English could have been a useful course? Can't we manage to bring our assignments closer to life situations both on the campus and in the community in which college men and women will be expected to play an active part after they leave college?

A second method by which freshman writing may be motivated is through shared reading experience. That this approach is in great favor just now is indicated by the titles of some collections of readings which have come to my desk recently. Here are a few random samplings: *A Collection of Reading for Writers*, *A Modern Reader*, *A Reader for Writers*, *A Writer's Reader*, *Ideas for Writing*, *Reading and Writing*, *Readings for our Times*. Then there are the anthologies which include, in addition to articles of current interest,

selections in prose and poetry from the great literature of the past which the "passionate few," to use Arnold Bennett's phrase, have kept alive. Several colleges even successfully build their freshman composition around a *Great Books* course.

One thing to remember, however, in the use of such material, whether it be as models for expository writing or as stimulation for discussion, is that contact must be made and maintained with the student's world if he is to respond in the desired way. To know the world of the college freshman of 1951-52, as far as it is possible for those of us who are attempting to guide him in the communicative arts to know it, is vitally important. The freshman cannot be sure at this point whether he will be able to prepare for the profession he has set his heart on; he cannot even be sure that he will complete more than his freshman year. Is it any wonder that he may have lapses in thinking that we red-pencil as "lack of coherence"!

It took us some time to know our veterans, but we had, in a sense, had a common experience with them for we shared in the war as civilians. We conserved our gasoline coupons and meat stamps; we worked at civilian defense and Red Cross. It was our war, too, and we had vivid accounts of it in letters from boys who never could write themes and from girls who had at last found satisfactory expression for their ideas in canteens and recreation centers. Then, in 1945, when our classes began filling up with boys straight from months of fighting in the front lines and girls who had left the campus to wear the uniform of the WAC or the WAVE, we had the greatest challenge of our teaching experience. There was no problem of motivation; there was only the problem of helping them to say what they wanted to say more effectively. Some-

times they were disillusioned and cynical; sometimes they were pitifully inarticulate or stumbling in their efforts to communicate; but they were willing and eager learners, and even in the overcrowded classrooms most of them managed to do better than average work. They disagreed with accepted points of view, not always with logical reasoning, but they were alert and alive, and they had a personal sense of values.

How many times this fall when you were discussing an assignment from the reader your class was using did you notice one of your students looking abstractedly out of the window, or trying to pull himself together quickly when you asked "Mr. McCoy, do you agree with the central idea of the article?" Of course, we must expect our freshman to do the tasks we assign them in reading and writing or reading for writing or reading and thinking, but if the freshman doesn't eagerly respond at the moment to an article by William James on "Pragmatism's Conception of Truth" or Kirtley Mather's "The Future of Man," it may be because the summons to his army "physical," which he received the day before, has a more direct bearing than Mather's article on his own future. Let us be firm but at the same time understanding with the pretty blonde in the third row who cut class three times in a week. Her whole beautiful world may have just collapsed as she heard that the 37th National Guard Unit had been called up. I'm wondering if many of our readings aren't geared up to the veterans whom we were just beginning to understand by the time they were being replaced by high school graduates who have been accelerated, in whose world the atom bomb has become a commonplace and the third world war a certainty.

A third type of motivation which we all use is that in which we define the

type of writing expected: narration, description, exposition and argumentation, and suggest that the freshman draw upon his own experience and observation for his subject matter, emphasizing "that it is the way in which you tell it that makes it interesting." After you manage to read through the forty-ninth paper in a package of fifty, and have broken off half a dozen red pencils, do you ever wonder if you have given the indifferent and unwilling sufficient light and inspiration to explore his rich and as yet only partially understood world of personal experience and creative imagination? It takes a great deal more than an assignment suggested by a basic textbook to make a student aware of his resources, and a great deal more than red pencilling to help him know the joy and satisfaction of saying what he thinks and feels well enough so that it really is a shared experience. The teacher who can help the freshman to have a respect for good writing and to know the pleasure which a mastery of words gives, truly deserves more recognition than he gets; unfortunately, all too often he remains unhonored while his colleagues find time to publish in the scholarly journals. For time it takes, hours and hours of it, if freshman teaching is well done; time for careful reading and re-reading of themes; time for conferences on the mechanics of expression; often time just for listening as the freshman lets you look into his confused and insecure world where conflicts, and family as well as personal tensions, are often at the bottom of what appears to be poor thinking and half-hearted effort. It is not enough to recall the world of our freshman days, it is not even enough to recall the freshman's world of 1946-47 when we thought we were done with war and could take up the "unfinished business" which the war had interrupted. We must be realistically aware



of the deep anxiety, the breakdown of certainty, and the growing despair which cause so many to try to run away from problems that seem too great to solve. We must try to help our freshmen, who in a few months may be in the armed services, to find discipline in doing routine tasks well, and perspective and courage in a shared reading experience which includes a discussion of good contemporary thinking and a discovery of the ageless wisdom that has come down to us from the pages of great books.

In conclusion, I should like to go back for a moment to the question of whether successful motivation is different in a university environment even though the human material with which we deal is not. One factor obviously is the larger number of students on the campus and the fewer opportunities for friendly, informal student-instructor contacts at football games, convocations, or in the canteen. Hence it is probably more difficult to make the freshman feel that his freshman instructor is interested in his world and sympathetic with his problems in adjustment. Then, at a state university which admits any high school graduate there is likely to be a greater difference in ability than where freshmen are admitted on a predictable point average. Furthermore, the staff of instructors may include graduate students who are get-

ting teaching experience, with or without adequate supervision, and who, at the same time, are under pressure to complete their own Ph. D. studies. Finally, in an urban university such as Western Reserve or Wayne or Cincinnati there will be a wider divergence in cultural background and greater difficulty in finding common interests among students who attend only part time and continue to live at home and seldom attend university functions, and who, consequently, have little sense of "belonging." The service course appeal should help to motivate successfully even as diversified a group as one finds in a state or urban university. The shared reading experience, if it is motivated with an understanding of the cultural, age, and intellectual level of the group, whether created by selection or through mere chance, can also be the means on this, as on any level, of making the writing experience meaningful. Finally, motivating the student to explore his world and write about it honestly and with understanding, with assurance that what he writes will not be considered trivial, and by so doing, to understand better the dignity and worth of his own personality in a world of shifting values, should produce themes that we can read without being bored. And that, to my way of thinking, is the best indication that our motivation has been good.

# Motivation in Liberal Arts Composition and/or Communication Courses<sup>1</sup>

JAMES HOCKER MASON<sup>2</sup>

As a preface to my remarks, I should like to present two quotations. The first is a statement by Guiseppe Mazzini in "An Essay on the Duties of Man, Addressed to Workingmen."

The difficulty lies, not so much in convincing them, as in rousing them from their inertia, and inducing them, when once convinced, to act . . .

The second quotation is from our old friend Cassius, in *Julius Caesar*.

The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,  
But in ourselves, that we are underlings.

In turning to the discussion of motivation in the liberal arts course in composition and/or communication, I should like to give credit to those people who have given me the benefit of their thoughts on this problem. For the most part, they have been teachers of English in the smaller liberal arts colleges in the central, southern, and southwestern sections of the United States. Many especially valuable ideas have come to me also from discussions of this problem which I have had with my own freshmen in my classes at Arkansas State College.

Judging from the discussions which I have had, the situations confronting teachers in the smaller liberal arts colleges are approximately the same. Further, I have found considerable similarity in and agreement on statements made by teachers and those made by students on the problem.

It seems to me that our discussion is one which fits perfectly into the general

theme of this convention, for the matter of motivation in composition and communication is one of "English and Human Personality." The situations which we as teachers of freshmen face are problems dealing with and concerned with human personalities. What are the problems? Whose problems are they? How are the problems to be faced?

The problems of the students in our classes are problems which your generation and mine have forced on them. Our students' problems are our problems—yours and mine. We have, first of all, created false standards about our language. In the second place, we have tended to create false standards about and false approaches to composition and/or communication. While I should like to dwell on these two points at greater length, time will not permit. I can simply refer you to the article by E. R. Steinberg in *College Composition and Communication* for October, 1951, under the title "Some Basic Assumptions for Courses in English Composition."

Let us look at a third way in which we have created problems for ourselves. Too many of us have, unconsciously, I hope, erected formidable barriers between ourselves and our students. To put it bluntly, we have not created good personnel relations between our students and ourselves. As one of my students told me in class the other day, "You'd be surprised how few times in my entire school experience I have seen a teacher smile or act even half-way human." It may seem a little thing, but if students feel there is a barrier between themselves and their teachers, we have a problem.

<sup>1</sup> A digest of a paper read at the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the NCTE, Hotel Sheraton-Gibson, Cincinnati, November 23, 1951.

<sup>2</sup> Arkansas State College, Jonesboro.

A fourth way in which we create our own problems lies in our neglect of sound psychological principles in our teaching practices. If we are not skilled in the use of simple psychological principles, how can our teaching be successful?

The picture is, of course, not as dark as I have painted it. The truth of the matter is that the best teachers of English in our smaller liberal arts colleges have recognized the fact that "the fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves" and have attacked the problems facing them with intelligence and zeal. The specific answer seems to be found in the way in which Mazzini's statement has been interpreted. "The difficulty lies, not so much in convincing them, as in rousing them from their inertia, and inducing them, when once convinced to act. . . ." In some departments of English the "them" has referred to individual members of the department; they had to be roused to action. In some colleges, the "them" has been the students, and in some cases the rousing from states of inertia has been accomplished by the simple process of having the teacher interested—genuinely interested—in creating student interest in composition. For the most part, problems of motivation have been faced or met by a refurbishing of two phases of the teaching process.

In industry it is axiomatic that "People must be treated as individuals." The foreman is taught that his workers may make or break him and that he must have a "good-personnel-relations" attitude. This industrial axiom has been taken over—lock, stock and barrel—by many departments of English. Conscious efforts are being made to improve personnel relations between the teacher and the people in his job—his students—who make or break him. Conscious efforts are being made to "educate" students to an awareness of the purposes

of courses in composition and communication. I recommend to you William M. Fox's article, "Effective Teacher-Student Communication," in the October, 1951, issue of the Southwestern Publishing Company's *Collegiate News and Views*. In this article you find a clear statement of the type of thing many English teachers have told me they are doing in their colleges.

While many teachers of English have refurbished their ideas regarding personnel relations, I am more impressed with another type of refurbishing, the polishing of teaching techniques. If some of these techniques reflect practices which have been successful in high school composition classes, I might report what one of my friends in a small Tennessee college said. "What many college teachers forget is that there is only a three-month period in time between a high school senior and a college freshman. What worked three months back will work as well in September."

There are, according to my informants, four major teaching techniques being refurbished by our better teachers today.

The first of the teaching techniques is that of using good salesmanship. You will remember that the four-step basic sales technique is (a) prepare for the sale, (b) explain the product, (c) demonstrate the product, and (d) close the sale. Course work in composition and/or communication can be sold in various ways. One is through getting group approval of the work to be done. Another is through the use of student suggestions. A third way is through the use of media whereby students can get recognition for their work, perhaps through publications like *The Green Caldron* (University of Illinois) and *The Arrow* (Arkansas State College).

The second of the teaching techniques is that of using the proper materials. The



first and most important material to use is the student himself. In the present-day immature-mature student is to be found all that a teacher could ask for in the way of subject matter for composition-communication work. With all the situations which face today's student, he cannot avoid thought about them and about how he is affected by them. What more natural approach to the matter of composition can be found for him than the one which affords him an opportunity to put his reactions into writing, thereby giving him some measure of release, psychologically speaking? One of the many reports on this method of creating interest in composition and of overcoming students' mental inertia is David Mallery's article, "Release: A Human Relations Approach to Writing," in the October, 1950, *English Journal*. Something of the nature of this type of approach to writing may be found in M. L. Rider's article, "Personality Development Through a Free Writing Program," which has been privately reprinted by the State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania.

Something of the same approach to composition work is evident in the practice of getting the students' reaction to local, national, and international affairs. Some, of course, will prefer to express their reactions to seasonal and regional topics; one such topic which I have found many of my students using is that of "Geese in the Cotton," in which they have expressed their reactions to a local agricultural practice. Some teachers have told me that their students have written successful papers using the title "The Draft and I."

The second type of materials which many teachers have told me they use in various ways to overcome student mental inertia and to create interest in writing consists of the various visual

aids: one-figure and two-figure pictures, cartoons, clippings, jokes, records, tape recordings, projectors, bulletin boards, and others.

A third teaching technique which many teachers are refurbishing successfully is one which utilizes salesmanship and the right materials and adds something to them. Teachers are stressing the idea: "Think BEFORE you write." These teachers tell me that in each type of written work they attempt to keep before the students such questions as these: "How does my writing read?" "Did I say what I meant to say?" and "Does what I say make sense?"

Further, these teachers with whom I have talked have revealed a striking uniformity in the use of one method of creating interest in composition and communication. This method requires work on the part of the teacher, a type of work on which, in each case, the teacher had to be sold. This method of teaching requires that the teacher write *with* his students and that he submit his paper for the same type of criticism by his students that he gives their papers. Many have told me that this technique has been the deciding factor in creating student interest. From my own experience, I can truthfully say that it is most effective.

I should like to pass on to you two other methods which are being used by some teachers with varying degrees of success. One is the use of daily cards—of whatever size the teacher specifies—on which the students write "freely" whatever comes to their minds. These cards serve as sounding boards. They enable the teacher to guide the student toward fuller expression of ideas which are merely hinted at first. The second method is that of writing letters to the editors of student publications and local newspapers; I am told that this

technique has been used with particular success by the teachers at Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls.

The fourth major teaching technique which I shall mention is one which many teachers use to motivate further compositions. This involves the marking of turned-in papers. Students are frequently motivated to further work by a teacher's use of courtesy in making corrections, for example, the use of "please" in such a note as "See me, please." Similarly, a comment such as "This paragraph doesn't seem to be up to the level of the others" is something of a touch of diplomacy that can be used as a motivating medium. Teachers tell me that the use of decency and discretion in the marking of errors—the number and quality of error marked—can be a powerful factor in motivating students to further work.

In conclusion then, from the point of view of the smaller liberal arts colleges, as seen in the statements of their

English faculty members most concerned with Freshman English, these things may be said relative to the problems of motivation of composition and/or communications — problems which I will remind you fit into the general theme of this convention "English and Human Personality." Freshman English staffs are facing problems of and in themselves and of and in their students. They are meeting these problems by overcoming their own mental inertia and by creating in themselves an interest in their work; from these activities they are creating interest on their students' parts in composition and/or communication, thus overcoming the students' mental inertia. These things are being done through the proper use of materials—stressing the prime material, the student—and the proper use of methods.

But, in the words of Antoine de St. Exupery, which are quoted on the inside cover of our convention's program, "Too many men are left unawakened."

# Darkness Visible: A Reply to Professor Lloyd

MARTIN STEINMANN, JR.<sup>1</sup>

"Thus I repeat," writes Donald J. Lloyd in reply to my reply to his reply to Kenneth L. Knickerbocker's reply to Norman Lewis,<sup>2</sup> "it is the professional duty of those who write in our journals about the English language to inform themselves about linguistics, and to square what they say with it. That is about what I said in my previous paper. I offer it as a truism, but if it is disputable, I should be glad to see it disputed. I wish that Professor Steinmann himself, if he wishes to refute me, would meet me squarely on this point and not attempt such diversions as he undertook in his first essay, and which I find, if I may use his word in what I take to be his meaning, exasperating."

I should welcome Mr. Lloyd's invitation to address myself to (though not to refute or even to dispute) this point because it is precisely the sort of point that I addressed myself to in my first essay and I might, therefore, have the advantage that practice is said to confer—I should welcome it if I were convinced that this point was the point of his first essay; but I am not, and for

two reasons. First, he began his first essay by enumerating four *other* points, continued it by announcing that "I shall develop these points one by one," and concluded it by developing them one by one. The exasperating diversions that I undertook in my first essay were analyses of these four points. Second, since a truism is (according to Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary*, edited by a staff of distinguished linguistic scientists) "an undoubted or self-evident truth, esp. one too obvious or trifling to mention," and since Mr. Lloyd's point about professional duty is, as he says, a truism, I cannot believe that Mr. Lloyd or anyone else would devote two essays totaling nearly four thousand words to arguing a point "too obvious or trifling to mention." If Mr. Lloyd can suffer another of my paraphrases, what his truism amounts to is this: "I (Mr. Lloyd) approve of the writings of those whose factual sentences about the English language are true. Readers, go ye and do likewise! Such writings, hurrah!" I, Steinmann, also approve of such writings. Readers, go ye and do likewise! Such writings, hurrah! Here, as Mr. Lloyd wrongly contends is another connection, his heart and mine do beat as one (to despise factual truth would ill become the master of the Vienna school that he flatteringly takes me to be); and here, so universally is factual truth approved, all hearts beat as one. I don't want to address myself to this truism, for it is not the point of his first essay. We must, I think, borrow one of the techniques of linguistic investigation recommended by him, and look at what he said and not at what he says he said;

<sup>1</sup> University of Minnesota.

<sup>2</sup> The bibliography is as follows: (1) Lewis, "How Correct Must Correct English Be?" *Harper's Magazine*, CXCVIII, 1186 (March, 1949), 68-74; (2) Knickerbocker, "The Freshman Is King; or, Who Teaches Who?" *College Composition and Communication*, I, 4 (December, 1950), 11-15; (3) Lloyd, "Darkness Is King: A Reply to Professor Knickerbocker," *ibid.*, II, 1 (February, 1951), 10-12; (4) Steinmann, "Darkness Is Still King: A Reply to Professor Lloyd," *ibid.*, II, 2 (May, 1951), 9-12; (5) Lloyd, "Linguistics and Professional Publication on Language: A Reply to Professor Steinmann [sic]," *ibid.*, II, 3 (October, 1951), 7-10.

and what he said is to be found in the four enumerated points mentioned above and in the development of them. I don't want to dispute this truism; for I accept it, and truisms are by definition sentences that no one wants to dispute. I don't want to refute it, for I can't. And I can't refute it; for, like the four enumerated points, it is normative (though this truism was not the point of his first essay, it is the sort of point he made there).

What I do want to do in this essay is to restate and amplify the point made in my first essay: that Mr. Lloyd's four points were normative, and that normative sentences cannot, as he still supposes they can, be inferred from factual ones, and, conversely, factual ones cannot, as he still supposes they can, invalidate normative ones. This I can do best by first making clear what I mean by normative sentences.

Semantically, all sentences fall into one of two classes: (1) cognitive and (2) noncognitive. Cognitive sentences are either true or false and fall into one of three subclasses: (1.a.) factual (synthetic, descriptive, empirical, scientific), (1.b.) logical (analytically true), and (1.c.) contradictory (analytically false). Factual sentences, by virtue of the facts which they purport to describe, are either true (or more or less probable) or false; logical, by virtue of their meaning, always true; and contradictory, by virtue of their meaning, always false. For example (1.a.) "all carnivores have three eyes," which is false (though factual) because some carnivores do not have three eyes; (1.b.) "all carnivores are flesh-eating animals," which is true because "carnivores" and "flesh-eating animals" mean the same thing; and (1.c.) "no carnivores are carivores" or "no carnivores are flesh-eating animals," which is false because it asserts and denies the same thing. Noncognitive

sentences, however, are *neither true nor false* and fall into one of three subclasses: (2.a.) interrogative, (2.b.) imperative (volitional - motivational, directive), and (2.c.) expressive (emotive or affective). For example: (2.a.) "do all carnivores have three eyes?" (2.b.) "approve of carnivores," and (2.c.) "carnivores, hurrah!" or "carnivores, boo!"—which, because they assert nothing, factual or logical, are neither true nor false.

Normative sentences—though they have the form of cognitive sentences, and though they have cognitive components which are either true or false—are essentially noncognitive and, to the extent that they are noncognitive, neither true nor false. I say "essentially noncognitive" because, when normative sentences provoke disagreement, as they often do, the disagreement centers about their noncognitive meaning rather than their cognitive. The truth or the falsity of their cognitive components is not at issue (their cognitive components are, in fact, almost always true); it is a disagreement in *expressed* attitudes—a clash of wills—rather than a disagreement about *stated* facts. For example: "carnivores are wonderful!" which has the cognitive component (1.a.) "I [the speaker] approve of carnivores" (which is true if the speaker does approve of carnivores), but which is essentially a combination of the noncognitive (2.b.) "approve of carnivores" or "go ye and do likewise" and the noncognitive (2.c.) "carnivores, hurrah!" (which are neither true nor false). The foregoing example has the form of a factual sentence and has for its cognitive component a factual sentence: it states a fact—not, it should be noted, about carnivores—but about the speaker. Some normative sentences, however, have the form of logical sentences and have for their cognitive components both factual and logical sentences. For example: "all true



carnivores are members of the Democratic Party," which has the cognitive components (1.a.) "I approve of flesh-eating animals who are members of the Democratic Party" and (1.b.) "carnivores are, by definition, members of the Democratic Party," but which is essentially a combination of the noncognitive (2.b.) "approve of such animals" and the noncognitive (2.c.) "such animals, hurrah!" Normative sentences such as the one in this example are what Charles L. Stevenson calls persuasive definitions.<sup>3</sup> Their logical components are, of course, always true. Other normative sentences have for their cognitive components additional factual sentences. For example: "carnivores ought to keep their feet dry," which might have for one of its components the cognitive (1.a.) "if carnivores keep their feet dry, they are not likely to suffer consequences of which they are known to disapprove [influenza, say]." Some other forms that normative sentences often take are "x is good [or: "bad"]," "x is right [or: "wrong"]," "x is superior [or: "inferior"]," "it is the duty of every Y to do [or: "not to do"] x," and "all real Y's are x's"—though not all sentences in these forms are normative ("this knife is a good one," for instance, might be the vague equivalent of the cognitive [1.a.] "this knife has a strong, sharp, rust-proof blade," and have no noncognitive meaning).

Strictly speaking, normative sentences cannot be validated or invalidated by

either inductive or deductive logic. For, when such sentences are disputed, disagreement centers about their noncognitive meaning; noncognitive sentences are neither true nor false; and logic is concerned only with truth and falsity. They may, however, be accepted or rejected; and arguments may be given for acceptance or rejection. But these arguments cannot consist of factual premises alone; they must—tacitly, at any rate—contain in addition at least one normative "premise." For example:

Premises: (i) "Roosevelt brought prosperity back to the country" (factual).

(ii) "Presidents who bring prosperity back to the country are great presidents" (normative).

Conclusion: "Roosevelt was a great president" (normative).

This argument collapses at once if the second (normative) premise is not accepted. The second premise may, of course, be supported by other arguments; but they, too, must include at least one normative "premise" and so on *ad infinitum*.

I must add that the only purpose of this definition and analysis of normative sentences is clarification. It is not my intention to exalt the cognitive above the noncognitive. Nor do I want to maintain that my *analyses* of normative sentences are the rhetorical equivalents of normative sentences: a sip of gin followed by a sip of vermouth is not a martini. Nor, finally, do I want to deny that the terms "true" and "false" are sometime predicated of the noncognitive components of normative sentences (this usage permits Mr. Lloyd's normative point about professional responsibility, for instance, to be called a truism, and accounts for such phrases as "a true religion" and "false values"); but, in this usage, these terms signify agreement or disagreement with the attitudes expressed by—or willingness or unwill-

<sup>3</sup> *Ethics and Language* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944), ch. ix. I should like once again to acknowledge my great debt to this book, though I must add that Mr. Stevenson might not endorse all that I have said in my two essays and is not responsible for my errors. And I should like to call attention to Hans Reichenbach's excellent *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951), esp. ch. xvii.



ingness to comply with the imperatives contained in—normative sentences.

Now, as I pointed out in my first essay and shall point out again, the four enumerated points of Mr. Lloyd's first essay are all normative. What I took them to express—or, at least, to imply—is acceptance of the doctrine of usage and rejection of the rival doctrine of correctness; and what I took his development of them to argue is that the former doctrine may be inferred from, and the latter invalidated by, the facts of linguistic science. Mr. Lloyd, in his second essay, concedes that, in respect of the latter doctrine, I read him aright; for, he says in both essays, "The doctrine of correctness has been so thoroughly refuted by modern students of language that its expression is a mark of ignorance of linguistics." He denies, however, that he supported the doctrine of usage.

To turn to his first essay for a moment, the last three at least of his four points certainly seem to indicate his support of that doctrine. In the second of these points, for instance, he says that "The nineteen 'disputed expressions' have all been carefully studied and found to be in good use in this country." His second essay concedes that the phrase "in good use" "might conceivably mean" what my paraphrase of its cognitive meaning took it to mean—"in use in the dialect of a certain socioeconomic class" (that is, in Standard English)—but dismisses my paraphrase of its noncognitive meaning as "fanciful embroidering." But what is the function of the word "good" in this phrase if not to express Mr. Lloyd's approval of the use that has been found to obtain in a certain dialect, and what is such approval if not acceptance of the doctrine of usage? And, in his third and fourth points, he speaks of certain expressions as being, or not being, su-

perior to certain others. What is the function of the word "superior" here if not to indicate his approval of certain expressions and his disapproval of certain others; and, since he goes on to contend that Mr. Knickerbocker would not have called certain expressions superior had he not been ignorant of the facts of usage as revealed by linguistic science, what is such approval if not acceptance of the doctrine of usage? Indeed, I should plume myself upon having, between his first and his second essays, changed his mind about that doctrine if (i) I had refuted or attempted to refute it in my first essay, and (ii) I did not find him arguing for it again, in his second essay (and, what is more, synchronizing my poor heart with his in support of it).

As for (i), far from attempting to refute the doctrine of usage, I went to great pains to show that, since the sentences designated by doctrine are normative, they cannot be refuted by anyone or anything. My point about the doctrines of both usage and correctness was that—since the sentences designated by those doctrines are persuasive definitions, since the cognitive, logical components of such definitions are logically (analytically) true whatever facts linguistic or any other science may uncover, and since their noncognitive components are neither true nor false—the sentences so designated cannot be formally refuted; that, in other words, Mr. Lloyd, in supposing, as he still supposes, that factual sentences drawn from linguistic or other sciences can refute or validate persuasive definitions, was mistaken. The sentences that express doctrines are not factual—we don't speak of the Doctrine of Gravity or the Second Doctrine of Thermodynamics or even of Grimm's or Verner's Doctrine. Such sentences are normative; and—though they may, as I pointed out above and in my first

essay, be accepted or rejected and argued for or against—they cannot be confirmed or infirmed by factual sentences, and arguments for or against them must contain at least one normative “premise.” I repeat: the sentences of science are factual; and linguistic science—if it is, within the usual acceptance of the term, to be called a science—is quite neutral in respect of all doctrines.

As for (ii)—though Mr. Lloyd, in his second essay, denies that he accepts the doctrine of usage and says that

As a member of the educated group he [the college teacher of composition] may prefer certain practices and follow them, but it is not his professional function to enforce these, or, indeed, to enforce any. It is his function to describe the situation and describe it accurately, so that on the basis of trustworthy information his students may choose the status they wish to attain and the group they wish to conform to, and may know the grounds they base their decision on—

he says also that the teacher is “commissioned by his office to guide his students in the use of the standard language,” and (offering us a persuasive definition) that, “as a principle of investigation [whatever that may mean]—in its proper context [whatever that may be]—it [the doctrine of usage] cannot be gainsaid: ‘usage or practice is

the basis of all the correctness there can be in language’ ” (and it is here that he wrongly takes my heart to beat as one with his).

But my purpose in this essay, like that in my first, is not to refute or dispute the doctrine of usage or to show that Mr. Lloyd accepts it or to defend the doctrine of correctness—and certainly not to discourage the study of linguistic science—but to show that the four numbered points in his first essay, like the truism which he takes to be the main point of both of his essays, are normative and, hence, cannot be logically inferred from the factual sentences that constitute any science; and, further, that the doctrine of correctness cannot be invalidated—and, whether he accepts it or not, the doctrine of usage validated—by the findings of any science. I wish that, from the time that Mr. Lloyd must spend reading such invaluable matter as *American Speech* and Mr. Bloomfield’s *Language*, he could spare a few moments to dip into some of the classics of logic and semantics recommended in my footnotes and into such magazines as *Philosophical Studies*. If I may venture a normative sentence, it is the professional duty of those who make inferences in our journals to inform themselves about logic.

# Professors' English

ROBERT J. GEIST<sup>1</sup>

When Professor Knickerbocker invented his dialog<sup>2</sup> between two college professors using the nineteen "solecisms" whose acceptability in *everyday speech* (according to the original *Harper's* article) is the subject of controversy, he needlessly invoked his imagination. He might better have listened to the speech of his peers, where, with two exceptions, he would have found all the locutions in his dialog. He wouldn't have heard "we was" with or without a preceding *if*, and he wouldn't have heard, "The train due to the storm was late." He would, however, have heard, "The train was late due to the storm." He would also have heard some really "heady stuff, this licensed speech" that makes the nineteen "solecisms" rather unheady at best.

Unaccustomed to listening critically to the speech of my peers, I heartily disbelieved when, in Pooley's *Teaching English Usage* (p. 99), I read about "the current prevalence of the phrases 'can't hardly' and 'can't scarcely' in the daily usage of educated people, including the majority of teachers." Shortly afterwards a colleague, Ph.D., phoned me and, among other things, said, "You don't hardly expect a student to get a perfect score on a test like that." He is not alone. I have heard the phrase used by two other colleagues in ordinary conversation. Another phone call, another English Ph.D., and another locution: "... without you and I being on campus all day." This matched an earlier "for my brother and I to go to school" by a fifth English Ph.D. These "and I" speakers have, of course, not

only freshman company but also royal company. For Princess Elizabeth see an Associated Press dispatch (Nov. 1, 1951, in the *Detroit Free Press*); for King George see *Life*, Oct. 29, 1951, p. 87.

"Solecisms" don't occur merely in private conversation. A sixth Ph.D. informed a literary group of students and faculty, "You had ought to give us your names by Friday." Again, a distinguished professor and retired dean, welcoming a learned group to his university, said, "Each of them have so much to learn from the other." I could go on, but why lose more friends?

Sometimes these professorial aberrations from textbook prescriptions find their way into print:

There is no use denying it if you are one of those who does not like poetry.

—C. W. Cooper, *Preface to Poetry* (1946), p. 4.

It is in this dialect that the Old English homiletic prose, as well as the alliterative poetry, are carried on . . .

—R. M. Wilson, *Early Middle English Literature* (1939), p. 111.

We see there how neither the priest nor the prophet were lacking in any generation . . .

—G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama* (1939), p. 688.

. . . from which modern handwriting and italic type derives . . .

—G. B. Harrison, *Shakespeare Major Plays and the Sonnets* (1948), p. 588, fn. 31.

The above quotations—all contemporary — may, of course, be taken to support Professor Knickerbocker's thesis that the freshmen have recently done us professors in. "The rising tide of the uneducated and the overly educated," ably abetted by lexicographers and

<sup>1</sup> Michigan State College, East Lansing.

<sup>2</sup> "The Freshman is King; or Who Teaches Who?" *College Composition and Communication*, 1 (Dec., 1950), 11-15.

"powerful but ignorant giants" of literature, has apparently deluged the language. In the light of these phrases it would be futile to cite the many excellent studies of the history or currency of the locutions labeled solecistic. From personal observation, however, one can point out that professors use the original nineteen solecisms not only in everyday speech but frequently in writing, and that the "powerful but ignorant giants" include some eminent names of not particularly recent vintage. Let's look at the solecisms in Professor Knickerbocker's order of decreasing acceptability:

1. *I will pay . . .* My collection of printed *I will's* doesn't happen to include anyone I know to be a professor, though it does include contributors to the *Saturday Review of Literature* and the *New York Times Book Review*. It also includes quotations from these "powerful but ignorant giants":

. . . before quoting what his disciples have said in the present century, I will refer to a few passages of the master.

—Newman, *The Idea of a University*, Discourse VII.

But I will deal the more civilly with his two poems, because nothing ill is to be spoken of the dead . . . I will only say that . . . I shall say the less of Mr. Collier, because in many things he has taxed me justly.

—Dryden, Preface to the *Fables*.

2. . . *won't do business with*. Surely this proscription is the nonsense up with which Winston Churchill is alleged to have refused to put. Quotation would be unnecessary had not Professor Knickerbocker publicly termed the locution a solecism.

I always enjoyed administration, largely because of the character of the men I worked with or under.

—R. M. Lovett, *All Our Years*, p. 102.

. . . his daughter would soon be happily provided for.

—Dickens, *Great Expectations*, Chapter 52.

The Rosicrucians are a people I must bring you acquainted with.

—Pope, Introduction to *The Rape of Lock*.

. . . tongues, which I am not acquainted with.

—Addison, *Spectator* No. 1.

The wine of life is drawn, and the mere lees

Is left this vault to brag of.

This bodiless creation ecstasy

Is very cunning in.

'Tis a naughty night to swim in.

I will wear my heart upon my sleeve

For daws to peck at.

Possibly in making us professors solecistic, Shakespeare has been abetted by that arch-villain the lexicographer, for generations of Americans were exposed to these sentences:

Utensils are tools to work with.

This is a kind of knowledge which good boys dispense with.

—Webster, *Elementary Spelling-Book* (rev. ed.), pp. 54. 120.

3. *nice, awful, mad*. That these words are largely colloquial and do not occur frequently in print is true. That they cannot or do not have more than one meaning is false. That the colloquial meanings are finding their way into print is probable.

I am all for brief books, but this one is too brief, and in spots it runs awfully shallow.

—Marquis James, *N. Y. Times Book Review*, Sept. 17, 1950, p. 6.

In short, he would have got mad. That she was the one who was mad, and that he was in the position of hanging around till she had made up her mind what to "do about it," emphasized only too clearly where the guilt lay . . .

—Charles Jackson, *The Fall of Valor*, p. 172.

4. *have got*. Perhaps the wide diffusion of this phrase, which I have found rather infrequently in edited writing, can again be attributed to the lexicographer, who for years exposed the uneducated to the sentence:



He has got a new tub.

—Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

How were these uneducated to know that they must resist the pull of a preterit-present tendency that has decidedly affected the verb structure of English?

5. *Go slow*. Possibly we can hang the highway departments for this one, and Webster too.

Rabbits have large ears and eyes, that they may hear quick, and see well in the dark.

—*Ibid.*, p. 35.

That *-ly* is increasingly the sign of an adverb—as in Professor Knickerbocker's "overly educated"—is true enough, but *-ly* is not yet a universal.

Hattie looked square into her eyes . . .

—Bernard DeVoto, *Mountain Time*, p. 354.

6. *It is me*. This phrase is, of course, adapted to speaking situations, and consequently one is not likely to find it in the ordinary writing professors engage in. Yet at least two professor-poets have used objective forms as complements of the verb *to be*:

Now these are me, whose thought is mine, and hers.

—A. J. M. Smith, *News of the Phoenix and Other Poems*, p. 4.

Them it was their poison hurt.

—A. E. Housman, *Shropshire Lad*, LXII.

7. *Reason is because*. My collection does not happen to include any giants of the past. I do not know how old the locution is. I can hardly believe, though, that freshmen had much influence on the following:

Perhaps the reason that these sketches strike so at the heart of the land is because the human element in them is merely an accent against a landscape limitless and untamed.

—C. C. Dobie, in *American Writers on American Literature*, p. 422.

Nor can I believe that freshmen—or the rising tide of the uneducated—had much influence on Lin Yutang, Eleanor Roosevelt, John Gunther, Marchette Chute, Charles Jackson, or Dorothy Dix, all of whom use the locution. I can believe that the repeated meaning in *reason* and *because* calls attention to itself when the words are close together, that it serves a useful purpose when the words are far separated. (I know the term *far separated* doesn't appeal to those who assign grammar to pure mathematics.)

8. *Who did you meet?* Since *who* and *whom* are shibboleths par excellence of educated writing, one is not likely to find many "incorrect" examples in professorial writing. Professorial speech, however, is a very different matter. I would propose—not altogether facetiously—an objective test to grade novellists. When Upton Sinclair writes as author, he uses *who* and *whom* in accordance with textbook prescriptions; his educated speakers do likewise. When John P. Marquand writes as author, he also follows the prescriptions; his educated speakers do not. In *B. F.'s Daughter*, for example:

Well, who do you know? (p. 212)

Look who I caught. (p. 203)

Who are you talking about, Ruthie? (p. 82)

I might be able to tell you who to go and see. (p. 147)

If Charles Jackson, English professor and novelist, had difficulty with the mathematics of

to see whom it was he loved

—*Fall of Valor*, p. 209,

a powerful but ignorant giant had difficulty with a simpler mathematical problem:

The original papers . . . shall be freely exhibited to whomsoever . . . may desire a sight of them.

Hawthorne, *Scarlet Letter*, "The Custom House."



Since mathematical grammar hadn't arrived in Shakespeare's time, we can overlook his use of *who* and *whom*.

9. *Walk further*. The dictionaries and purist grammars I have consulted seem to have led me astray. Under *farther*, for example, the *New Collegiate* distinguishes: ". . . *further*, onwardness or advance not only in space or time . . ." Led to believe that *farther* was the word under fire, I've been neglecting *further*. It, I thought, was settled.

10. *due to* (adv.). An article by Professor Kenyon in *American Speech* for 1930 should have removed all doubt of the currency of this locution. By 1952 the doubt obviously hasn't been removed. Five years after the article appeared, and unaware of it, I dutifully learned the distinction between the adjective and adverb uses of the phrase and began to impart this refined knowledge to freshmen. I plead guilty to contributing to the myth that adverbial *due to* is somehow low-class.

Due to the general nature of these works the treatment of the Middle Ages is somewhat brief.

—Urban T. Holmes, Jr., *History of Old French Literature*, p. 16.

The precise position of linguistics among the sciences is a matter of dispute, due, in great part, to its somewhat composite nature.

—Louis H. Gray, *Foundations of Language*, p. 4.

11. *We only have five left*. The professors:

Masefield only found himself when he turned to an older tradition. . . .

—Robert Shafer, *From Beowulf to Thomas Hardy*, new edition, II, 1026.

References to page and line have, as a rule, been restricted to words only occurring once.

—J. R. Clark Hall, *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 3rd ed., p. ix.

. . . we can only record two transcripts. . . .

—H. H. Hensen, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., III, 895.

The powerful but ignorant giants:

. . . he only defended his work, indeed, by asserting. . . .  
Matthew Arnold, Preface to the 1853 *Poems*.

. . . I was only conscious that what would have been a pleasure. . . .  
—Hawthorne, *Scarlet Letter*, "The Custom House."

I only saw in him a much better man than I had been. . . .

—Dickens, *Great Expectations*, Chapter 54.

12. *Everyone . . . their*. In my observation we professors seem to have done pretty well in removing this common locution from our printed writing. Thomas Wolfe, however, who was subjected to freshman influence, provides a quotation:

And everyone, spurred to hunger by the cold air and their long journey. . . .

—*The Portable Thomas Wolfe*, p. 316.

Possibly as influential as freshmen on Wolfe were the following:

. . . if he sees anybody else nodding either wakes them himself, or sends his servant to them.

. . . when everybody else is upon their knees.

—Addison, *Spectator*, No. 112.

Everybody endeavoring to remove their goods. . . .

—Pepys, *Diary*, 2 Sept. 1666.

Son ilkan wit pair wand forth stepe.

—*Cursor Mundi* (British Museum ms.), 1. 10763.

13. *Can I, please?* I would suggest that one might usefully record the questions asked when colleagues wish to borrow books, notes, desk space, or almost anything except another helping of dessert.

14. *to accurately check*. There is no space here, or reason, to debate the oft-

debated split infinitive. The professorial attitude toward and use of the construction are perfectly illustrated, I think, in Robert Morss Lovett's *All Our Years*. In the text of the book I found no split infinitives. In an extract from the official record of the oral proceedings before a congressional subcommittee, appended to the text (p. 341), I found this:

Mr. Lovett: . . . I wish to further explain that . . . Possibly lexicographers have been undermining us again. In the *White Latin Dictionary* I find split infinitives used constantly in definitions.

15. *different than*. The *New Collegiate* has, it seems to me, a very accurate usage note. The following quotations merit inclusion here:

Their use is mechanically no different than that of the period.

—Tristram P. Coffin, *College English*, XII (Jan., 1951), p. 217.

. . . the figures of other British poets, all writing a different kind of verse than Masefield wrote.

—Horace Gregory, *Sat. Rev. Lit.*, May 20, 1950, p. 14.

The enclosed proof of your biographical sketch to be included in the second edition of the *DIRECTORY OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS* has a different appearance than that for the first edition.

—Form letter, signed by Jacques Cattell, editor.

16. *as if she was*. I find *were* more commonly than *was* after *as if* or *as though*. Yet

It is as though the freshman study of language was a two-legged bird.

—Kenneth Oliver, *College Composition and Communication*, I (Oct., 1950), p. 4.

Again the freshmen may have to share their responsibility for this "solecism" with powerful but ignorant giants:

But Mr. Burke . . . speaks as if France was a village. . . .

—Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man*, Part I.

. . . the particular question, which . . . is usually discussed as if the interest of children was everything. . . .

—J. S. Mill, *Essay on Liberty*, Chapter V.

17. *Less difficulties*. The *New Collegiate* says *less* means "not . . . so many"; the ACD specifically says it does not. I'm inclined to think the ACD reflects professorial usage more accurately. But since lexicographers are suspect, anyway, I'll merely cite my lone professorial quotation:

. . . the cities were governed with the least bloodshed, least quarrels and fewest revolutions.

—G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama*, p. 296.

In concluding, I hope I have helped to dismiss the freshman as the answer to who teaches *whom*—a reasonably important point (which Professor Steinman<sup>3</sup> serves to obscure in his volitional-motivational attack on Professor Lloyd's attack<sup>4</sup> on Professor Knickerbocker's article) — important because Professor Knickerbocker's freshman is merely a playful vehicle for the discredited thesis that the language is degenerating from a former perfection, that it is rapidly going to the dogs. I wonder whether English professors or freshmen are ultimately responsible for these sentences:

A Selective Service spokesman said there has been some confusion among medical men as to whom is and whom is not a reservist.

—quoted in the *New Yorker*.

Every entry and every definition of the previous edition have been reviewed. . . .

—*Webster's New Collegiate*, p. iv.

<sup>3</sup> *College Composition and Communication*, II (May, 1951), 9-12.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II (Feb., 1951), 10-12.

## Secretary's Report No. 4

GLENN J. CHRISTENSEN

Annual business meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

Venetian Ballroom, Metropole Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Friday, November 23, 1951.

Attendance 128.

Presiding, George S. Wykoff, Purdue University.

1. Chairman George S. Wykoff expressed the appreciation of the CCCC to Professor Charles F. Wheeler and to Mrs. Wheeler for their eminently successful planning for the luncheon.

2. The minutes of the business meeting of the Officers and Executive Committee, March 29, 1951, were read and approved.

3. Members of the Executive Committee and Editorial Board were introduced.

4. The Secretary reported the Job Exchange inactive. He pointed out that if no further action were taken it would quietly expire, but that if it were to be revived it should be vigorously, preferably under one member, appointed for a term longer than that of the officers in order to gain continuity. No action was taken, but members were invited to send suggestions to the Secretary. The question was raised from the floor whether the Job Exchange did not duplicate services offered by the AAUP and the CEA.

5. Treasurer W. Wilbur Hatfield submitted a financial statement for January 1, 1951 - October 31, 1951:

Income, all sources.....	\$3,187.45
Expenses.....	2,291.32
Balance on hand,	
Oct. 31, 1951.....	\$ 896.13

6. Editor Charles W. Roberts renewed his invitation to members to submit or suggest sources for usable material and critical comment for the *Bulletin*. He announced that workshop reports from the March 1951 meeting would be printed in the December issue, and requested that members failing to receive issues send a card with their address to Mr. Hatfield's office.

7. Chairman Wykoff reminded the members that one year ago the CCCC had undertaken study of six projects (listed in minutes for Milwaukee meeting, November 24, 1950). No work has been undertaken on these projects so far, largely because of a lack of funds; the need for the studies continues.

The chairman pointed out that the CCCC has no constitution and by-laws, and that its ways of doing business have been developed as the various needs arose. Some of these ways are recorded in the minutes; others are merely understood. It appears desirable to draw these together, and the Secretary was, therefore, asked to prepare a code of conduct of affairs covering (a) the duties of the officers, and (b) the modes of procedure which have been established.

8. Report of the Nominating Committee, T. A. Barnhart, Chairman.

a. Karl Dykema, Youngstown College, now Program Chairman, nominated and unanimously elected Associate Chairman.

b. The following proposal was made (here given slightly amended as passed):

The Officers of the CCCC and the Nominating Committee propose that the officer group be enlarged to include an Assistant Chairman for the Conference.

This Assistant Chairman would be elected in November at the annual business meeting. The next November he would automatically be nominated as Associate Chairman, and the following November as Chairman.

After discussion of the responsibilities of the proposed office, the reasons for the proposal, and the election of the first Assistant Chairman if the motion carried, the motion to establish the proposed office was carried.

c. Twelve successors to retiring Executive Committee members were nominated. There being no nominations from the floor, the nominations were closed and the candidates elected. The new members are: Strang Lawson, Colgate; F. Earl Ward, Macalester; L. A. King, Muskingum; John Hodges, Tennessee; Francis Shoemaker, Wisconsin; Jerome Archer, Marquette; McDonald Williams, Wilberforce; Kathryn Scott, Georgia State College for Women; T. J. Farr, Tennessee Polytech. Inst.; Emma Beekman, Los Angeles Trade and Technical; Donald Bird, Stephens; Gordon Mills, Los Angeles City College. Following their election, the newly elected Associate Chairman,

Karl Dykema, and those new members of the Executive Committee who were present were introduced.

9. At this point the retiring Chairman turned the meeting over to the new Chairman, Harold B. Allen, Minnesota.

10. Associate Chairman Karl Dykema presented the tentative plans for the spring meeting which will be held at the Hotel Carter, Cleveland, Ohio, March 28-29, 1952. Members were invited to submit comments or suggestions.

11. New business:

a. It was moved and carried that an Assistant Chairman be elected at the present business meeting.

b. The names of Freida Johnson, Peabody, and T. A. Barnhart, St. Cloud State Teachers, were placed in nomination. Mr. Barnhart was elected.

c. The motion was made and carried that the Chairman appoint a Constitutional Committee. The Chairman asked that the naming of the Committee might be delayed to give time for consideration.

12. The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p. m.

**Make Your Hotel Reservations Now to Attend**  
**THE 1952 CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION**  
**AND COMMUNICATION**

**HOTEL CARTER, CLEVELAND**  
**MARCH 28-29**

**A PREVIEW OF THE PROGRAM**

**First General Session: WHAT EMPLOYERS EXPECT FROM COLLEGE COURSES IN COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION**

K. A. Stonex, Head of Technical Data Department, General Motors Proving Grounds  
W. K. Bailey, Vice-president, Warner & Swasey Company.  
T. R. Schellenberg, Director, The National Archives

**Second General Session: WHAT OUR ACADEMIC COLLEAGUES EXPECT FROM COURSES IN COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION**

Paul Anders, Dean of Business Administration, Fenn College  
Elmer Hutchisson, Acting President, Case Institute of Technology  
Fletcher Andrews, Dean of Law, Western Reserve University

**Panel Discussions:**

**DESCRIPTIONS OF THREE FRESHMAN PROGRAMS BY THEIR DIRECTORS**

Strang Lawson, Colgate  
A. H. Marckwardt, Michigan  
T. J. Kallsen, West Virginia

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF USAGE STANDARDS**

Porter Perrin, Washington  
A. H. Marckwardt, Michigan  
R. C. Pooley, Wisconsin

**CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF TESTS**

Paul Diederich, Educational Testing Service  
O. E. Palmer, Michigan State

**THE PUBLISHERS' PROBLEM IN PROVIDING TEXT MATERIAL FOR THE FRESHMAN COURSE**

Howard Allen, Western Reserve University Press  
Hugh Sebastian, Macmillan  
Carter Harrison, Houghton Mifflin  
T. R. Bledsoe, Rinehart

**BUILDING THE FRESHMAN COURSE ON A SINGLE BODY OF SUBJECT MATTER**

E. N. Duncan, Vanderbilt (LITERATURE)  
Donald Lloyd, Wayne (LINGUISTICS)  
(Someone from Denver) (SEMANTICS)

**AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS**

Frederick Sorenson, Alabama Polytech.

**GAUGING RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATION**

Francis Shoemaker, University of Wisconsin

Thirteen workshops on such topics as: teacher-training, imaginative writing, logic, grammar, reading, articulation with high school, the writing laboratory, organization, administration, etc.

**WRITE TO HOTEL CARTER, CLEVELAND, OHIO NOW**  
**FOR RESERVATION OF YOUR ROOM**

**Further details should reach you by mail about the time you receive this issue of C.C.C.**